

Message Text

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 01 GENEVA 01873 231221Z

42

ACTION EUR-25

INFO OCT-01 IO-14 ISO-00 L-03 DODE-00 PM-07 DRC-01 ACDA-19

CIAE-00 H-03 INR-10 NSAE-00 NSC-07 PA-04 RSC-01

PRS-01 SPC-03 SS-20 USIA-15 NEA-10 TRSE-00 SAJ-01

OMB-01 AEC-11 SAM-01 OIC-04 /162 W
----- 068991

P R 231111Z MAR 74

FM USMISSION GENEVA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 4792

INFO AMEMBASSY OSLO

ALL CSCE CAPITALS 114

USNMR SHAPE

USCINCEUR

US LIAISON OFFICE SACLANT WASHDC

USDOCOSOUTH

CINCLANT

C O N F I D E N T I A L GENEVA 1873

VIENNA ALSO FOR US DEL MBFR

E.O. 11652: GDS

TAGS: PFOR

SUBJ: CSCE: SUBCOMMITTEE ON MILITARY SECURITY (CBM'S);
NEUTRALS' REVISED RESOLUTION

REF: STATE 055891

SUMMARY: NUMBER OF ALLIED DELS HAVE RECEIVED INSTRUCTIONS ON
REVISED NEUTRAL RESOLUTION SETTING FORTH RESERVED OR CRITICAL
ATTITUDES TOWARDS SEVERAL OF ITS PROVISIONS, PARTICULARLY THOSE
AFFECTING MBFR. IN SOME CASES, ALLIES HAVE SUBSTITUTE LANGUAGE
TO OFFER. THERE IS GENERAL FEELING AMONG ALLIES, HOWEVER, THAT
IN FORMULATING RESOLUTION NEUTRALS HAVE MODERATED SOME OF THEIR
ORIGINAL DEMANDS AND THAT EFFORT SHOULD BE MADE TO ACCOMMODATE
THEIR CONCERNS PARTICULARLY IN ORDER TO MAINTAIN GOOD RELATION-
CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 GENEVA 01873 231221Z

SHIP WITH THEM FOR SAKE OF BROADER CONFERENCE PURPOSES. SOVIETS

HAVE SAID LITTLE ABOUT NEUTRALS' REVISED RESOLUTION BUT ARE EXPECTED TO COUNTER IT WITH MINIMALIST FORMULATIONS OF THEIR OWN. DEPARTMENT'S VIEWS ON RESOLUTION ARE NEEDED DURING WEEK MARCH 25-29. END SUMMARY.

1. REVISED NEUTRAL RESOLUTION (TEXT GENEVA 1712) WAS DISCUSSED AT NATO CAUCUS MARCH 22. CANADIAN, UK, DUTCH, FRG, AND BELGIAN REPS HAD RECEIVED INSTRUCTIONS ON REVISIONS AND OUTLINED THESE FOR GROUP. FRENCH DID NOT ATTEND BUT HAD PRESENTED SOME PRELIMINARY VIEWS AT EARLIER CAUCUS. FOLLOWING ARE POSITIONS EXPRESSED BY THESE REPS ON SPECIFIC PROVISIONS OF THE NEUTRAL RESOLUTION:

A. NEW PREAMBULAR PARAGRAPH. IT WAS NOTED THAT THIS FORMULATION IS EXTRACTED FROM PARAGRAPH 22 OF HELSINKI RECOMMENDATIONS AND EACH OF THE REPS CITED ABOVE SAID THE PARAGRAPH WAS THEREFORE ACCEPTABLE.

B. PART II: INTRODUCTORY SENTENCE. FRG REP SAID INTRODUCTORY SENTENCE WAS ACCEPTABLE BUT BELGIAN REP THOUGHT PHRASE "WILL PROCEED FROM THE FOLLOWING PREMISES" INVOLVED TOO STRONG A COMMITMENT AND MIGHT THEREFORE BE TROUBLESOME IN TERMS OF MBFR. UK REP PERSONALLY THOUGHT PHRASE MIGHT BE TONED DOWN AND AMENDED TO READ "WILL PROCEED FROM THE FOLLOWING COMMONLY HELD PREOCCUPATIONS."

C. PART II: PARAGRAPH ONE. FRG FOUND THIS ACCEPTABLE. FRENCH THOUGHT "INTERRELATED" SHOULD BE DELETED SINCE IT SEEMED AN EXAGGERATION.

D. PART II: PARAGRAPH TWO. UK FOUND PARAGRAPH UNACCEPTABLE ESPECIALLY AS REGARDS USE OF WORD "INTERDEPENDENT". CANADIAN REP SAID OTTAWA WANTED AVOID ANY MENTION OF MEDITERRANEAN BUT HE HIMSELF THOUGHT THIS UNAVOIDABLE. DUTCH FAVORED DELETION OF WORD "INDIVISIBLE". FRG PROPOSED SUBSTITUTE FOLLOWING PREAMBULAR-TYPE FORMULATION: "IN CONSIDERING SECURITY IN EUROPE, THE BROADER CONTEXT OF WORLD SECURITY, AND IN PARTICULAR THE RELATIONSHIP WHICH EXISTS BETWEEN THE SECURITY IN EUROPE AND IN THE MEDITERRANEAN AREA . . . I

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 03 GENEVA 01873 231221Z

E. PART II: PARAGRAPH THREE. CANADIANS FOUND FIRST SENTENCE ACCEPTABLE. BRITISH DID ALSO BUT WANTED CHANGE "SHALL" TO "WILL". DUTCH PROPOSED INSERTING FOLLOWING PHRASE AFTER WORDS "IN EUROPE" IN FIRST SENTENCE: "IN CONFORMITY WITH THE GENERAL OBJECTIVE OF THESE NEGOTIATIONS WHICH IS TO CONTRIBUTE TO MORE STABLE RELATIONS AND TO THE STRENGTHENING OF PEACE AND SECURITY IN EUROPE." UK, FRG, DUTCH, AND CANADIANS SAID SECOND SENTENCE UNACCEPTABLE. CANADIANS SUGGESTED FOLLOWING

SUBSTITUTE: "WHEN NEGOTIATING, AGREEING AND IMPLEMENTING ARMS LIMITATION AND DISARMAMENT MEASURES IN EUROPE, THE SECURITY INTERESTS OF ALL STATES PARTICIPATING IN THE CSCE SHALL BE TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT IN ORDER THAT MEASURES TAKEN TO PROMOTE THE SECURITY OF ONE REGION OF EUROPE ARE COMPATIBLE WITH THE SECURITY INTERESTS OF OTHER REGIONS." IN CONTRAST, FRENCH HAD INDICATED AT EARLIER CAUCUS THAT ORIGINAL SECOND SENTENCE IN NEUTRAL RESOLUTION WOULD BE ACCEPTABLE TO THEM. THEY ADDED THAT THEY COULD NOT AGREE TO ANY SPECIFIC MENTION OF MBFR IN A CSCE DOCUMENT, HOWEVER. FRENCH DID NOT PARTICIPATE IN MARCH 22 CAUCUS AND SEVERAL REPS EXPRESSED VIEW THAT IT WAS HIGHLY IMPORTANT INVOLVE FRENCH IN FURTHER ALLIED DISCUSSIONS OF NEUTRAL RESOLUTION.

F. PART II: PARAGRAPH FOUR. UK, DUTCH, AND FRG REPS FOUND THIS SENTENCE ACCEPTABLE PROVIDED THAT PHRASE "BY THE NEGOTIATING FORA" WAS DELETED. CANADIAN REP SUGGESTED FOLLOWING SENTENCE BE SUBSTITUTED: "THE STATES PARTICIPATING IN CSCE WHICH ARE INVOLVED IN MULTILATERAL NEGOTIATIONS ON ARMS LIMITATIONS AND DISARMAMENT IN EUROPE SHALL RECOGNIZE THE NEED TO PROVIDE OTHER STATES PARTICIPATING IN CSCE INFORMATION ABOUT RELEVANT DEVELOPMENTS, PROGRESS AND RESULTS OF THE NEGOTIATIONS."

G. PART III: DUTCH THOUGHT PART III WAS REDUNDANT AND AWKWARDLY DRAFTED. FRG REP SAID IT APPEARED AIMED AT MBFR AND EXPRESSED VIEW THAT IT SHOULD EITHER BE REPHRASED IN MORE GENERAL TERMS OR, ALTERNATIVELY, NARROWED IN SCOPE SO AS TO SAFEGUARD MBFR.

2. ALL OF THE ALLIED REPS WHO COMMENTED ON THE NEUTRALS' RESOLUTION EXPRESSED VIEW THAT IT REPRESENTED A STEP TOWARDS A COMPROMISE. THEY OBSERVED THAT THE MORE EXTREME DEMANDS WHICH SEVERAL OF THE SPONSORING NEUTRAL DELEGATIONS HAD MADE EARLIER HAD NOT BEEN INCONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 04 GENEVA 01873 231221Z

CORPORATED. BRITISH REP AID LONDON HOPED ALLIES WOULD, IN TURN, TAKE STEPS TOWARDS ACCOMMODATING NEUTRALS AND BE AS FLEXIBLE AS POSSIBLE. BRITISH STRESSED THAT IT WAS NECESSARY TO HAVE NEUTRAL BACKING ON CBM ISSUES AND THAT IN MANY OTHER CSCE AREAS AS WELL THE ATTAINMENT OF ALLIED GOALS WILL DEPEND ON STICKING CLOSELY TO NEUTRALS. IN PARTICULAR, BRITISH HOPED THAT IT WOULD BE POSSIBLE FOR ALLIES TO MEET NEUTRAL CONCERNS IN FORM OF OPERATIVE FORMULATIONS AND NOT JUST IN PREAMBULAR CLAUSES.

3. IT WAS GENERAL FEELING AT CAUCUS THAT SOVIETS, WHO HAVE BEEN QUIET SO FAR ON NEUTRAL REVISIONS, WOULD PROBABLY MAKE COUNTERPROPOSALS OF A MINIMALIST NATURE, EXPANDING ONLY A BIT ON THE TWO PARAGRAPHS THAT APPEAR AT THE END OF SECTION II OF THE DRAFT GENERAL DECLARATION THE SOVIETS TABLED AT HELSINKI LAST JULY. ALTHOUGH FUTURE ALLIED TACTICS WERE DISCUSSED ONLY BRIEFLY AT

MARCH 22 CAUCUS, MOST REPS SEEMED TO AGREE WITH UK IDEA THAT FOR THE MOMENT IT SHOULD BE LEFT TO THE SOVIETS TO CONTEST THE NEUTRAL PROPOSALS AND THAT ALLIES SHOULD SUBSEQUENTLY ACT AS AN HONEST BROKER BETWEEN SOVIETS AND NEUTRALS AND TRY TO SHAPE COMPROMISES. MANY REPS EXPRESSED VIEW THAT ALLIES SHOULD PREPARE JOINTLY AGREED COMPROMISE PROPOSALS WITHOUT DELAY SO AS TO HAVE THEM AT HAND.

4. AT CAUCUS, US REP WAS REPEATEDLY PRESSED FOR WASHINGTON'S VIEWS. TO BE MOST EFFECTIVE, THESE SHOULD BE GIVEN US DURING WEEK MARCH 25-29 SINCE SUBCOMMITTEE WILL THEN BE BEGINNING ITS DRAFTING ON TOPICS COVERED BY PARTS II AND III OF NEUTRALS' RESOLUTION.DALE

CONFIDENTIAL

NNN

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: X
Capture Date: 01 JAN 1994
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: AGREEMENT DRAFT, COLLECTIVE SECURITY, COMMITTEE MEETINGS, MEETING REPORTS, MILITARY PLANS
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 23 MAR 1974
Decaption Date: 01 JAN 1960
Decaption Note:
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Authority: golinofr
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 28 MAY 2004
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1974GENEVA01873
Document Source: CORE
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: n/a
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: GS
Errors: N/A
Film Number: D740062-1102
From: GENEVA
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1974/newtext/t19740320/aaaaasbe.tel
Line Count: 182
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE, ON MICROFILM
Office: ACTION EUR
Original Classification: CONFIDENTIAL
Original Handling Restrictions: n/a
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 4
Previous Channel Indicators:
Previous Classification: CONFIDENTIAL
Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Reference: STATE 055891
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Authority: golinofr
Review Comment: n/a
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 26 MAR 2002
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review History: RELEASED <26 MAR 2002 by kelleyw0>; APPROVED <06 MAY 2002 by golinofr>
Review Markings:

Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
30 JUN 2005

Review Media Identifier:
Review Referrals: n/a
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: CSCE: SUBCOMMITTEE ON MILITARY SECURITY (CBM'S); NEUTRALS' REVISED RESOLUTION
TAGS: PFOR, CSCE, MBFR
To: STATE
Type: TE
Markings: Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005